

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Re-examination and favorable reconsideration in light of the above amendments and the following comments are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 - 6 and 8 - 23 are currently in the application. No claim has been allowed.

By the present amendment, claim 2 has been cancelled without prejudice; claims 1, 8, and 15 have been amended; and new claim 24 has been added to the application.

In the office action mailed October 14, 2004, claims 1 - 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the U.S. Patent No. 5,205,465 to Bogard et al. and claims 8 - 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bogard et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,272,809 to Robertson et al.

The foregoing rejections are traversed by the instant response.

The present invention broadly relates to a method of repairing a part, which method comprises the steps of providing a wrought part having a contact area and an anomaly that renders the part unsuitable, providing a high strength wrought material having a contact area, heating the contact area of the wrought material and the contact area of the wrought part through direct contact between the contact areas of the wrought material and the contact area of the wrought part by connecting the wrought material and the part to an electrical power source, and pressing the contact area of the material against the contact area of the part, wherein the material bonds to the part to render the part suitable.

With regard to the rejection of claim 1 on anticipation grounds over the Bogard et al. patent, it is submitted that this

rejection has been mooted by the amendment of claim 1. In particular, Bogard et al. teaches a method for replacing turbine disk airseal lands where a replacement land ring is solid state bonded to the disk in place of a worn or damaged land. When the replacement lands have been positioned, the replacement land ring is heated by an induction coil powered by an induction generator. Thus, Bogard et al. does not teach the step of "heating the contact area of the wrought material and the contact area of the wrought part through direct contact between the contact areas of the wrought material and the contact area of the wrought part by connecting the wrought material and the part to an electrical power source." For this reason, claim 1 as amended is clearly allowable over Bogard et al.

Claims 3 - 6 are allowable for the same reasons as claim 1 as well as on their own accord.

With regard to the rejection of claims 8 - 23 on obviousness grounds, the rejection fails for a number of reasons. First, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the references as suggested by the Examiner. The Bogard et al. patent teaches the bonding of a wrought material part to a wrought material replacement. Robertson et al. teaches or suggests a method wherein a cast part is bonded to a wrought part. Thus, Robertson et al. teaches away from both the teachings of the Bogard et al. patent and the claimed method, which both call for a wrought part and a wrought replacement material. Second, Robertson et al., in column 5 of the patent, teaches that the replacement blank "is fashioned of a material which has been precondition to give it low strength (emphasis added) and high ductility ...." This is in contrast to the present invention where the replacement material is a high strength wrought material. Thus, here again, Robertson et al.

teaches away from the present invention. Both independent claims 8 and 15 have been amended to include the step of "providing a piece of high strength wrought material having a contact area." It is submitted that claims 8 and 15 are allowable for the foregoing reasons.

Claims 9 - 14 and 16 - 23 are allowable for the same reasons as their parent claims as well as on their own accord.

New claim 24 is allowable because none of the cited and applied references teach or suggest the combination of method steps set forth therein. In particular, none of the cited and applied references teach or suggest using the claimed fixture and applying pressure to the claimed fixture during the bonding process.

For the foregoing reasons, the instant application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Such allowance is respectfully solicited.

Entry of the amendment appears to be in order since it does not raise any new issue which would require any further search or consideration by the Examiner. Nor does the amendment raise any issue of new matter.

Should the Examiner believe an additional amendment is needed to place the case in condition for allowance, she is hereby invited to contact Applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

A Notice of Appeal is enclosed herewith in the event that the Examiner maintains the rejections of record.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge the Notice of Appeal fee of \$500.00 to Deposit Account No. 21-0279. Should the

Appl. No. 10/074,736  
Amdt. dated Jan. 14, 2005  
Reply to office action of Oct. 14, 2004

Director determine that an additional fee is due, he is hereby authorized to charge said fee to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

John M. Robertson et al.

By 

Barry L. Kelmachter  
BACHMAN & LaPOINTE, P.C.  
Reg. No. 29,999  
Attorney for Applicants

Telephone: (203) 777-6628 ext. 112  
Telefax: (203) 865-0297  
Email: docket@bachlap.com

Date: January 14, 2005

I, Nicole Motzer, hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: "Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313" on January 14, 2005.

